

HELEN HARRISON,)	
)	
Plaintiff(s),)	Case No. 2:14-cv-00577-RCJ-NJK
)	
vs.)	ORDER DISCHARGING
)	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
SMITH’S FOOD & DRUG CENTERS, INC., et al.,)	
)	
Defendant(s).)	

On September 17, 2014, the Court denied the parties' stipulation for a 60-day extension to discovery deadlines and ordered that any renewed stipulation be filed no later than September 22, 2014. *See* Docket No. 13. The parties failed to file such a stipulation by that date. Instead, on October 9, 2014, Defendant filed a motion seeking a 60-day extension that is unopposed. *See* Docket No. 14; *see also* Docket No. 15 (ordering response to be filed no later than October 17, 2014). The resulting order to show cause is presently before the Court. *See* Docket No. 16.

The Court has received Defendant's response to the order to show cause which asserts, in essence, that the parties did not comply with the Court's order because they believed the case would settle at a mediation that had been scheduled for October 1, 2014. *See* Docket No. 19. While the Court supports efforts by parties to resolve cases amicably, the fact that parties are attempting to settle a case does not in any way justify disobedience of Court orders. *See, e.g., Martin Family Trust v. Heco/Nostalgia Enterps. Co.*, 186 F.R.D. 601, 603 (E.D. Cal. 1999) (counsel's belief that he did not need to comply with order because he was engaged in settlement negotiations was "utterly insufficient to avoid imposition of sanctions"). In this instance, the Court in its discretion will not impose sanctions.

1 But the Court warns the parties and their counsel that the Court expects strict compliance with all orders
2 and Local Rules in the future. The parties and counsel should expect future non-compliance will result
3 in the imposition of sanctions.

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 DATED: October 23, 2014

6
7 
8 _____
9 NANCY J. KOPPE
10 United States Magistrate Judge
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28